



Constraining SUSY using the relic density and the Higgs boson

Sophie Henrot-Versillé

► To cite this version:

Sophie Henrot-Versillé. Constraining SUSY using the relic density and the Higgs boson. Third JCL (Journées Collisionneur Linéaire), Dec 2014, Grenoble, France. in2p3-01096556

HAL Id: in2p3-01096556

<https://hal.in2p3.fr/in2p3-01096556>

Submitted on 18 Dec 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Constraining SUSY using the relic density and the Higgs boson

Outline:

- Constraining SUSY: Assumptions
- Illustration in mSUGRA
- TeV-Scale MSSM
- Conclusion



Phys. Rev. D 89, 055017 (2014)

Sophie Henrot-Versillé, R. Lafaye, T.Plehn, M.Rauch, D.Zerwas,
S.Plaszczynski, B.Rouille d'Orfeuil, M.Spinelli




Constraining SUSY

Assuming a specific SUSY model, the fundamental parameters (driving the mass spectrum) can be constrained:

- either by direct searches @the LHC
- Or/and via Standard Model -Higgs/rare decays- &Dark Matter... :

... But there is a wide variety of them



Constraining SUSY

Assuming a specific SUSY model, the fundamental parameters (driving the mass spectrum) can be constrained:

- either by direct searches @the LHC
- Or/and via Standard Model -Higgs/rare decays- & Dark Matter :

... But there is a wide variety of theories

Points that will be considered/
illustrated in this talk

MSSM

mSUGRA/CMSSM

NMSSM

Assumptions/Constraints ?


The input measurements

=> $m(\text{Higgs})$, and Ω_{cdm} are the most constraining

TABLE I. Some of the key measurements used in our analysis, including the error. The last number is the theoretical uncertainty on the supersymmetric prediction, except for the $\text{BR}(b \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$ and m_t for which no theoretical uncertainty is considered.

Measurement	Value and error	
m_h	$(126 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.4 \pm 3) \text{ GeV}$	[39]
$\Omega_{\text{cdm}} h^2$ Planck	$0.1187 \pm 0.0017 \pm 0.012$	[4]
$\Omega_{\text{cdm}} h^2$ WMAP-9year	$0.1157 \pm 0.0023 \pm 0.012$	[16]
$\text{BR}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$	$(3.2^{+1.5}_{-1.2} \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-9}$	[44]
$\text{BR}(b \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$	$(3.55 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-4}$	[45]
$\Delta\mu$	$(287 \pm 63 \pm 49 \pm 20) \times 10^{-11}$	[46]
m_t	$(173.5 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.8) \text{ GeV}$	[47]

$m(\text{higgs})$





+Xenon100 + Higgs Couplings +EW precision

Which tool for which computation:

Light Higgs mass : SUSPECT2
 Higgs BR : SUSY-HIT HDECAY
 Cold DM density : MICROMEAS
 Electroweak precision : SUSYPOPE
 B decay & $(g-2)_\mu$: SUSPECT2+MICROMEAS

Ω_{cdm} [Planck vs. Wmap]



Context

In this talk: illustration in mSUGRA & a TeV-scale 13 parameters MSSM

What was in the literature (@ the time of this paper) ??


FITTINO: LHC data + WMAP-7year on MSUGRA and NUHM
[J. High Energy Phys. 06 (2012) 098.]

MASTERCODE: same mSUGRA and nonuniversal Higgs models including Xenon100
[Eur. Phys. J. C 72, 2243 (2012).].

C. BOEHM et al.: Light neutralino DM with Planck + Higgs + Xenon100
in the TeV-scale MSSM [J. High Energy Phys. 06 (2013) 113.].

BayesFITS: MSUGRA + 9 parameters MSSM
[J.HighEnergyPhys.09(2013)061.][Phys. Rev. D 88, 055012 (2013).]

+ ..a lot more




Why this analysis ??

⇒ Up to date measurements

⇒ Wider explored SUSY parameters space

Dark Matter (DM)

- * Early Universe: all particles are in thermal equilibrium.
- * The Universe cools down and expands: interaction rate too small for equilibrium
- * As the density decreases the annihilation rate becomes small compared to the expansion: this is the LSP freeze out.



The number density of DM particle is given by:

H: the Hubble expansion rate

thermally averaged annihilation cross-section

$$\frac{dn}{dt} = -3Hn - \langle \sigma_{AV} \rangle (n^2 - n_{eq}^2)$$

Dilution from expansion

Annihilation processes

production processes

number density in thermal equilibrium

$$\Omega_{\text{cdm}} h^2 \approx 1. / \langle \sigma v \rangle$$





The neutralino as LSP

In the following we will assume the lightest **neutralino** to be the **LSP**.
 With R parity conservation: **the LSP is stable**.

The neutralinos are linear combinations of the neutral Higgsinos and EW gauginos.
 The neutralino mass matrix in the gauge eigenstates basis (\tilde{B} , \tilde{W}^0 , \tilde{H}_1 , \tilde{H}_2):

$$\mathcal{M}_N = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & 0 & -M_Z c_\beta s_W & M_Z s_\beta s_W \\ 0 & M_2 & M_Z c_\beta c_W & -M_Z s_\beta c_W \\ -M_Z c_\beta s_W & M_Z c_\beta c_W & 0 & -\mu \\ M_Z s_\beta s_W & -M_Z s_\beta c_W & -\mu & 0 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 = N_{11}\tilde{B} + N_{12}\tilde{W} + N_{13}\tilde{H}_1 + N_{14}\tilde{H}_2$$

Some contributions to the annihilation/co-annihilation cross section:




SFitter

General Philosophy:

- 1/ We build the likelihood function (measurements vs. predictions),
- 2/ We use Monte Carlo Markov Chains to explore the parameter space
 mSUGRA: 49 chains of 200k points each
 MSSM: 100 chains of 200k points each
- 3/ We build profile likelihoods

Profile Likelihoods

2D profiles are obtained after maximization of the likelihood function on all the other dimensions (except for parameter 1 and 2 that are fixed) of the parameter space



- ⇒ Equivalent $-2\ln(L_{\max})$ regions are found and will be illustrated with dedicated points
- ⇒ $-2\ln(L_{\max}) \approx 46$ (d.o.f=75) in mSUGRA: constant offset due to Δa_μ

NB: m_{top} is also let free within the error bars for all the fits

mSUGRA illustration

Parameters:

- m_0 the common scalar mass parameter
- $m_{1/2}$ the common gaugino mass parameter
- A_0 the common trilinear mass parameter
- $\tan\beta$ the ratio of the vacuum expectation values of the two Higgs doublets
- $\text{sign}(\mu)$ the sign of the Higgsino mass parameter
 - \Rightarrow both cases have been investigated: only $\mu > 0$ is shown below
- + the top mass

Assumed Bounds:

$m_0 < 5\text{TeV}$
 $m_{1/2} < 5\text{TeV}$
 $|A_0| < 4\text{TeV}$
 $\tan\beta \leq 60$

\Rightarrow Small number of parameters


\Rightarrow Highly correlated

The light higgs mass measurement constrains the parameter space through the top squark sector

The parameters are set at mGUT

We evolve the soft SUSY-Breaking parameters to the TeV scale [using SUSPECT2], and compute the corresponding mass spectra.

Annihilation channels: Illustration with mSUGRA







[5] The region of coannihilation in the neutralino-chargino sector. The LSP is mainly bino or Higgsino (not in mSUGRA)

mSUGRA

Coannihilation

$\Rightarrow M_{\text{top}}(\text{fitted value}) = 174. \text{ GeV}$

$\Rightarrow M(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) = 429 \text{ GeV}, M(\tilde{q}) \approx 2 \text{ TeV}, M(\tilde{g}) \approx 2 \text{ TeV}$







mSUGRA

A funnel

⇒ the LSP is mostly bino

⇒ $M_{\text{top}}(\text{fitted value}) = 173.9 \text{ GeV}$

⇒ $M(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) = 745 \text{ GeV}$, $M(\tilde{q}) \approx 3.4 \text{ TeV}$, $M(\tilde{g}) \approx 3.6 \text{ TeV}$







mSUGRA

h funnel

- ⇒ the LSP is mostly bino
- ⇒ $M_{\text{top}}(\text{fitted value}) = 174.2 \text{ GeV}$
- ⇒ $M(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) = 59 \text{ GeV}$, $M(\tilde{g}) = 476 \text{ GeV}$

Excluded by ATLAS/CMS Inclusive squark and gluinos searches





mSUGRA Planck vs. WMAP

Planck

$$(\Omega_{\text{cdm}} h^2 = 0.1187 \pm 0.0017 \pm 0.012)$$

WMAP

$$(\Omega_{\text{cdm}} h^2 = 0.1157 \pm 0.0023 \pm 0.012)$$



=> As expected the general features are **very similar**

=> The **light Higgs funnel is more detached** in the Planck case than in the WMAP case (consequence of the smaller error bar on the DM density)

What to expect @ the end of 2014:

- ☺ Planck will release the polarisation data and a more accurate Ω_{cdm} measurement
- ☹ The theoretical error is already dominant...statistical improvement will not help

MSSM

Assumptions:

- all squark masses above LHC actual limits $\approx 2\text{TeV}$ (except for the stop)
- M_3 is fixed @ 2TeV
- $A_b = 0$



13 parameters+the top mass:

$$\tan \beta < 61, M_1 < 4\text{TeV}, M_2 < 4\text{TeV}$$

$$M_{\tilde{\mu}L/R}, M_{\tilde{\tau}L/R}, M_{\tilde{q}3L}, M_{\tilde{t}R} < 5\text{TeV}$$

$$|A_t| < 4\text{TeV}, |A_\tau| < 4\text{TeV},$$

$$m_A < 5\text{TeV}, |\mu| < 2\text{TeV}$$

How parameters are related:

$$* M(\text{Higgs}) = f(m_A, \tan \beta, m_{t1}, m_{t2})$$

m_{t1}, m_{t2} are not related to the DM sector, nor to the light sq/gluino masses


$$* \text{The neutralino masses and couplings} = f(M_1, M_2, \tan \beta, \mu)$$

* Link between DM/Higgs = $f(\text{annihilation channels})$

MSSM constraints

As expected, we recover the mSUGRA points

h funnel: for $M_1 \approx 60 \text{ GeV}$ almost independent of M_2
An example \star : $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) = 58.5 \text{ GeV}$, $m(A/H) = 3626 \text{ GeV}$



Coannihilation

For example: \times
 $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) = 429 \text{ GeV}$
 $M(\tilde{\tau}_1) = 429.7 \text{ GeV}$


A funnel: same behaviour as for mSUGRA

An example \diamond : $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) = 398 \text{ GeV}$, $m(A/H) = 781 \text{ GeV}$

MSSM constraints

NEW MSSM regions

Large Higgsino Region splitted into $\mu \approx \pm 1.2 \text{ TeV}$
 Chargino/Neutralino annihilation dominates
 Example \oplus : $m(\chi^0_1) = 1 \text{ TeV}$



Bino-Higgsino region
 for $|M_1| \approx |\mu|$ and $\mu < 0$ [neutralino $\approx 50\%$ Bino/ 50% Higgsino]
 An example \oplus : $m(\tilde{\chi}^0_1) = 768 \text{ GeV}$
 Chargino/Neutralino co-annihilation

Summary

For mSUGRA: two main regions compatible with all measurements still remain:

- A narrow stau coannihilation at moderate $\tan\beta$
- A large A funnel region

In the TeV scale MSSM the remaining area for the parameters are:

- A narrow stau & light/A Higgs funnel regions
- A large mixed Bino-Higgsino neutralino area
- And a large Higgsino region with chargino and neutralino coannihilation.

(The stop coannihilation remains outside the scope of our model parameters)

=> The relic density and the Higgs mass measurements push SUSY toward a high new-Physics mass scale. Still, mSUGRA is far from being ruled out !

... We are waiting for the coming LHC running / DM searches / ...
for new constraints !..... Or discovery !

PLANCK 2014
Ferrara Conference (*)
TODAY !!


OutLook ?!

More Dark Matter Constraint ??

We constrain DM annihilation @ the epoch of recombination

Caveat: Planck and low-redshift anomalies (Pamela, Fermi etc...) can be compared ONLY under the assumption that the annihilation cross-section at the epoch of recombination was THE SAME as today

Thermally averaged annihilation cross-section \times the fraction of the annihilation energy that will affect the CMB



The dark gray dots show the best fit DM models for the Pamela/AMS-02/Fermi cosmic-ray excess as calculated by Cholis and Hooper.

The light gray stars show the best fit DM models for the Fermi galactic center gamma-ray excess as calculated by Calore 2014.



planck



DTU Space
National Space Institute



Science & Technology
Facilities Council



National Research Council of Italy



Deutsches Zentrum
für Luft- und Raumfahrt e.V.





UK SPACE
AGENCY





HFI PLANCK
a look back to the birth of Universe



MSSM Planck vs. WMAP



Reduce
The probability
With Planck



pMSSM interpretation




Non DCS data

1a	$BR(b \rightarrow s\gamma)$
1b	$BR(b \rightarrow s\gamma)$
2a	$BR(B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu)$
2b	$BR(B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu)$
3a	$R(B_u \rightarrow \tau\nu)$
3b	$R(B_u \rightarrow \tau\nu)$
4	Δa_μ
5a	m_t
5b	m_t
6	$m_b(m_b)$
7	$\alpha_s(M_Z)$
8a	m_h
8b	m_h
9	sparticle masses


List of CMS analyses

Analysis	\sqrt{s}	L	Likelihood	Ref.
Hadronic HT + MHT search	7 TeV	4.98 fb ⁻¹	method 1	CMS-SUS-12-011
Hadronic HT + MET + b -jets search	7 TeV	4.98 fb ⁻¹	method 1	CMS-SUS-12-003
Leptonic search for EW prod. of $\tilde{\chi}^0, \tilde{\chi}^\pm, \tilde{l}$	7 TeV	4.98 fb ⁻¹	method 1	CMS-SUS-12-006
Hadronic HT + MHT search	8 TeV	19.5 fb ⁻¹	method 1	CMS-SUS-13-012
Hadronic HT + MET + b -jets search	8 TeV	19.4 fb ⁻¹	method 2	CMS-SUS-12-024
Leptonic search for EW prod. of $\tilde{\chi}^0, \tilde{\chi}^\pm, \tilde{l}$ (ss, 3l and 4l channels)	8 TeV	19.5 fb ⁻¹	method 1	CMS-SUS-12-006


Prior from nonDCS data



Posterior for HT+MHT



Projection on $\Omega_{\text{cdm}} h^2$



Just to have a feeling:
Planck $\Omega_{\text{cdm}} h^2$

The neutralino mass is shifted to higher values